DETAILED ACTION

The instant application having Application No. 10/589481 filed on 4/20/07 is

presented for examination by the examiner.

Priority

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C.

119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been received.

Specification

The written description is objected to because of the reference on page 2, Patent

Document 1. Other patents can be incorporated by reference by simply mentioning

them. A reference note is not required.

Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent
and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the
patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the
abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an
improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should
include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly
those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use
thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use
thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the
abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of
the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Where applicable, the abstract should include the following:

(1) if a machine or apparatus, its organization and operation;
(2) if an article, its method of making;
(3) if a chemical compound, its identity and use;
(4) if a mixture, its ingredients;
(5) if a process, the steps.

Extensive mechanical and design details of apparatus should not be given.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is more than one

paragraph, too long, and has figure references. Correction is required. See MPEP

§ 608.01(b).

Claim Objections

Claims 3, 6, 7, 8, and 10-17 are objected to because of the following

informalities:

Each of the dependent claims should be written to incorporate all the limitations

of the parent claim. As such the dependent claims should reference their parent claim

by "the" method or "the" device, not "a" method or "a" device. Use of "the" removes any

doubt as to whether the method (or device) is the same method of its parent and not a

similar method.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:
Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as directed to non-statutory

subject matter of software, per se. The claims lack the necessary physical articles or

objects to constitute a machine or manufacture within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 101.

For a program to be statutory it must be stored on a computer readable medium.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by
another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent
granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the
applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section
351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States
only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2)
of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-6, 8-10, and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by USP 7,194,761 to Champagne.

As per claim 1, Champagne teaches an authentication proxy method

characterized by including the steps of:

determining whether a transmission request for a signal including authentication

data has been made from a contents providing server to a terminal device or not (col.

22, lines 44-47); and

creating a signal including the authentication data for the terminal device and transmitting the created signal to the contents providing server when it is concluded that the transmission request has been made (col. 24, lines 39-41).

As per claim 2, Champagne teaches an authentication proxy method characterized in that a distribution management device for managing distribution of signals including data of contents to one communication network performs: determining whether a transmission request for a signal including authentication data has been made from a contents providing server on another communication network in response to a distribution request for a signal including data of contents from a technical device through the one communication network or not (Fig. 4, 122 and col. 22, lines 44-47); and

creating a signal including the authentication data for the terminal device and transmitting the created signal to the contents providing server when it is concluded that the transmission request has been made (Fig. 4, 123 and col. 24, lines 39-41).

As per claim 3, Champagne teaches searching authentication data stored in a storage means in advance, so as to acquire authentication data corresponding to the terminal device, the contents or the contents providing server (Fig. 5, 303 and 305 and col. 21, lines 29-35); and

creating a signal including the acquired authentication data (Fig. 4, 123 and col. 24, lines 39-41).

As per claim 4, Champagne teaches a distribution management device characterized in that:

the distribution management device is provided between one communication

network and another communication network (Fig. 1 and col. 13, lines 50-55); and

when a transmission request for a signal including authentication data for a

terminal device on the one communication network has been made from a contents

providing server on the other communication network, the distribution management

device creates a signal including the authentication data for the terminal device and

transmits the created signal to the contents providing server (Fig. 4, 123 and col. 24,

lines 39-41).

As per claim 5, Champagne teaches a distribution management device

characterized in that:

the distribution management device is provided between one communication

network and another communication network (Fig. 1, 110 and col. 13, lines 50-55); and

the distribution management device comprises:

a storage means for storing authentication data about one or plural terminal

devices (Fig. 1, 150 and col. 14, line 1);

a data processing means for searching the storage means so as to acquire

authentication data [database] corresponding to one of the terminal devices (Fig. 1, 150

and col. 14, line 1); and

creating a signal including the acquired authentication data, when the terminal

device makes a distribution request for a signal including data of contents and a

contents server makes a transmission request for a signal including the authentication

data for the terminal device in response to the distribution request (Fig. 5, 303 and 305

and col. 21, lines 29-35); and

a communication means for transmitting the signal including the authentication

data to the contents providing server (Fig. 4, 123 and col. 24, lines 39-41).

As per claim 6, Champagne teaches the storage means stores one of plural

pieces of the authentication data for each of the terminal devices correspondingly to the

contents or the contents providing server (Fig. 1, 160 and col. 14, line 1); and

the data processing means searches authentication data corresponding to the

terminal device, the contents or the contents providing server (col. 16, lines 1-6).

As per claim 8, Champagne teaches the one communication network is a mobile

communication network for wireless communication with mobile terminal devices (col.

13, lines 56-63).

As per claim 9, Champagne teaches an authentication proxy method program

characterized by making a computer execute the steps of:

determining whether a signal indicating a request for authentication data for a terminal

device has been transmitted from a contents providing server or not in response to a

distribution request from the terminal device for a signal including data of contents (Fig.

4, 122 and col. 22, lines 44-47); and

creating a signal including the authentication data for the terminal device and

transmitting the created signal to the contents providing server through a

communication means when it is concluded that the signal indicating the request for the

authentication data has been transmitted (Fig. 4, 123 and col. 24, lines 39-41).

As per claim 10, Champagne teaches searching authentication data stored in a storage means in advance, so as to acquire authentication data corresponding to the terminal device, the contents or the contents providing server (Fig. 5, 303 and 305 and col. 21, lines 29-35); and

creating a signal including the acquired authentication data (Fig. 4, 123 and col. 24, lines 39-41).

As per claim 13, Champagne teaches the one communication network is a mobile communication network for wireless communication with mobile terminal devices (col. 13, lines 56-63).

As per claim 14, Champagne teaches the one communication network is a mobile communication network for wireless communication with mobile terminal devices (col. 13, lines 56-63).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7, 11, 12, and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Champagne in view of USP Application Publication 2005/0108746 A1 to Futagami et al., hereinafter Futagami.

As per claim 7, Champagne teaches that his system works for any type of network known in the art (col. 13, lines 47-60). One of the types of computer networks is the Internet. One of ordinary skill in the art would know that Internet protocols could be implemented in Champagne's system. While Champagne does not explicitly mention the use of the RTSP, Futagami teaches this use of this protocol in as part of authentication (0007). Because this protocol was well known art the time of the art, it would have been obvious to try this protocol within the system of Champagne. Therefore the claim is obvious because a person of ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options (RTSP authentication protocol) within his or her technical grasp. Furthermore applying a known technique to a known method and producing predictable results is within the ordinary capabilities of one skill in the art at the time of the invention.

As per claim 11, Champagne teaches that his system works for any type of network known in the art (col. 13, lines 47-60). One of the types of computer networks is the Internet. One of ordinary skill in the art would know that Internet protocols could be implemented in Champagne's system. While Champagne does not explicitly mention the use of the RTSP, Futagami teaches this use of this protocol in as part of authentication (0007). Because this protocol was well known art the time of the art, it would have been obvious to try this protocol within the system of Champagne.

Therefore the claim is obvious because a person of ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options (RTSP authentication protocol) within his or her technical grasp. Furthermore applying a known technique to a known method and producing predictable results is within the ordinary capabilities of one skill in the art at the time of the invention.

As per claim 12, Champagne teaches that his system works for any type of network known in the art (col. 13, lines 47-60). One of the types of computer networks is the Internet. One of ordinary skill in the art would know that Internet protocols could be implemented in Champagne's system. While Champagne does not explicitly mention the use of the RTSP, Futagami teaches this use of this protocol in as part of authentication (0007). Because this protocol was well known art the time of the art, it would have been obvious to try this protocol within the system of Champagne. Therefore the claim is obvious because a person of ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options (RTSP authentication protocol) within his or her technical grasp. Furthermore applying a known technique to a known method and producing predictable results is within the ordinary capabilities of one skill in the art at the time of the invention.

As per claim 15, 16, and 17, Champagne teaches the one communication network is a mobile communication network for wireless communication with mobile terminal devices (col. 13, lines 56-63).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure is listed on the enclosed PTO-892 form.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL R. VAUGHAN whose telephone number is (571)270-7316. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 7:30am - 5:00pm, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on 571-272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO

Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call

800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. R. V./
Examiner, Art Unit 2431
/Syed   Zia/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2431